

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. 121 was issued, which required an election between four groups of claims, in particular between method claims 1-22 as defined in Groups I, II and III and substrate claims 23-25 of Group IV. Applicants elect, with traverse, the method claims for prosecution in this application with a species election of Group I and has withdrawn the Groups II, III and IV claims.

Applicants understand that the restriction of species between the claims of Groups I, II and III is for the purpose of facilitating the Examiner's search claims. This, if a generic claim 1 is allowed, any dependent claims that are consistent with the generic claim 1 will also be allowed. Applicants have reviewed the species groupings and have determined that the claims of each grouping are properly classified as follows:

Group I: claims 1-5 and 11-22

Group II: claims 1-4, 6-8 and 11-22

Group III: claims 1 and 11-22

Claims 11-22 are generic to the species of each of Groups I to III so that those claims have been included in each grouping.

Furthermore, a review of the claims has revealed that the subject matter of the method claims is related to the subject matter of the substrate claims. In particular, claim 1 recites forming a recess in a front face of at least one of a support substrate or a source substrate that includes a zone of weakness, the recess having a configuration that, in conjunction with the zone of weakness, assists in defining a transfer layer in the source substrate; depositing a bonding material onto at least one of the front face of the source substrate or the front face of the support substrate; and bonding the front faces of the source and support substrates together in a manner to provide at least some of the bonding material in the recess. Claim 22 recites the structure that is obtained by this process. Therefore, searching with respect to the method and structure claims for this feature would not result in an undue burden on the Examiner and would of necessity be required in order to properly evaluate patentability for either claim Group. For this reason, it is believe that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn and that all claims should be examined together at this time.

Applicant believes that application is now in condition for allowance.  
The issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/27/04

*for* Stephen Filipek (Reg. No. 33,384)  
Allan A. Fanucci (Reg. No. 30,256)

**WINSTON & STRAWN**  
**CUSTOMER NO. 28765**  
(212) 294-3311